

Equations of state for nonlinear sigma-models II: Relations between resummation schemes, and crossover phenomena

S.Q.Yang and D.Belitz

*Department of Physics and Materials Science Institute,
University of Oregon,
Eugene, OR 97403
(February 6, 2008)*

Abstract

It is shown how a recent method to systematically extrapolate and resum the loop expansion for nonlinear sigma-models is related to solutions of the renormalization group equation. This relation is used to generalize the explicit equations of state obtained previously to models which display crossover phenomena. As an example we discuss Wegner's localization model and consider the crossover from symplectic to unitary symmetry.

PACS numbers: 64.60.Ak , 71.30.+h

I. INTRODUCTION

Nonlinear σ -models have proven useful in Statistical Mechanics for the description of both ferromagnetism [1] and Anderson localization of noninteracting electrons [2,3]. The description by a nonlinear σ -model allows to study these phase transitions in the vicinity of the lower critical dimension, which is $d_c^- = 2$ in either case. For the localization problem this description is particularly valuable, since no upper critical dimension is known for the localization, or Anderson, transition, no mean-field theory exists, and hence the usual methods of expanding about mean-field theory and the upper critical dimension are not applicable [4]. The question then arises whether it is possible to derive a simple equation of state [5] for the localization problem, which is capable of qualitatively describing both phases and the transition between them. The answer turned out to be affirmative, but in a somewhat restricted sense. An approximate equation of state was derived for the case of localization in the presence of time reversal invariance [6]. It turned out to correctly reproduce the critical behavior known from renormalization group (RG) methods to first order in an ϵ -expansion about $d = 2$ [2]. This equation of state became known as the 'self-consistent theory of Anderson localization', and it has been derived by a variety of techniques [6,7]. However, it was not obvious how to generalize this theory to models with broken time reversal invariance, or how to systematically include higher orders in the ϵ -expansion. Attempts to improve on this situation by exponentiating perturbation theory gave results that again were satisfactory only in the case of time reversal invariance [8].

In a recent paper [9], to be denoted by I, the present authors have derived equations of state for nonlinear σ -models that are based on a systematic loop expansion, and give physical results for localization models both with and without time reversal invariance. The method was also applied to nonlinear σ -models for Heisenberg ferromagnets. The basic idea in I was to obtain the RG β -function to a given order in the loop expansion, truncate it, and then construct a perturbation series for the relevant physical quantities (e.g. the conductivity in the case of localization, or the magnetization in the case of magnets) that yields the truncated β -function exactly. The resummation of this extrapolated perturbation series led to transcendental equations whose solution gave the desired equation of state.

Such an extrapolation and resummation of perturbation theory is essentially what the RG equation also achieves [3]. Indeed, one of the derivations of the 'self-consistent localization theory' made use of the RG equation [7]. It is therefore natural to ask whether there is a simple relation between these two methods. In the present paper we show that a simple relation does indeed exist, and how the RG equation method can be used to derive equations of state identical to those obtained in Ref. [9]. We then use this insight to derive an explicit equation of state for the case of localization with weakly broken time reversal invariance, when there is a crossover between two fixed points governed by different symmetries. The same method can be used to describe anisotropic Heisenberg ferromagnets [10]. However, the localization case is slightly more difficult since there the two fixed points governed by different symmetries appear at different orders in the loop expansion. Here we restrict ourselves to the localization problem, and just mention that essentially the same discussion, with some simplifications, applies to anisotropic magnets.

II. THE MODEL, AND ITS RENORMALIZATION

A. Definition of the Model

As in I, we consider Wegner's model for the localization of noninteracting electrons [2]. Both the model and our notation will be the same as in I, and so we will be very brief. Wegner's model is a nonlinear σ -model defined on the symmetric spaces $Sp(2N)/Sp(N) \times Sp(N)$ and $U(2N)/U(N) \times U(N)$ for systems with and without time reversal invariance, respectively. Quenched disorder is handled in these models by considering N replicas of the system, and taking the limit $N \rightarrow 0$ ("replica limit") after calculations. The action reads

$$S = \frac{1}{T} \int d\mathbf{x} \, tr (\nabla Q(\mathbf{x}))^2 + \frac{H}{T} \int d\mathbf{x} \, tr [\Lambda Q(\mathbf{x})] \quad , \quad (2.1a)$$

where Q is a $2N \times 2N$ matrix subject to the constraints,

$$Q^2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{1}_{2N} \quad , \quad tr Q(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad , \quad (2.1b)$$

and Λ is a block-diagonal matrix,

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1}_N & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbb{1}_N \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (2.1c)$$

with $\mathbb{1}_N$ the $N \times N$ unit matrix. The symmetry of the action is symplectic or unitary, respectively, depending on whether the matrix elements of Q are quaternion or complex valued. We will refer to these models as the symplectic and the unitary model, respectively. In both cases the matrix Q is hermitian, and in the symplectic model it is subject to the additional constraint $Q = C^T Q^T C$, where $C = i \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y$ with Pauli matrices $\sigma_{x,y}$.

It is well known that each of the two models defined by Eqs. (2.1) describes a localization transition of noninteracting electrons [4,11]. The bare coupling constant T in Eq. (2.1a) is proportional to the conductivity in self-consistent Born approximation (SCBA); it is a measure of disorder. $H = \Omega \pi N_F / 4$ with Ω the external frequency, and N_F the density of states at the Fermi level. The symplectic model describes the localization transition in systems that are time reversal invariant. If time reversal invariance is broken, e.g. by magnetic impurities, the critical behavior is instead described by the unitary model.

For later reference we also define an additional term [12], which we add to the action for the symplectic model,

$$\delta S = \frac{G}{4T} \int d\mathbf{x} \, tr [Q(\mathbf{x}), -i\sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_N]^2 \quad , \quad (2.2)$$

where $[a, b]$ denotes the commutator of a and b . The term δS breaks the symmetry of the symplectic model action, and for any nonzero G the asymptotic critical behavior of the phase transition described by the symplectic model plus the term δS is the same as that of the unitary model. For small values of G , however, the asymptotic critical behavior is preceded by a region that displays a crossover between the symplectic and the unitary fixed point. This model is relevant for localization with weakly broken time reversal invariance, e.g. in the presence of a small concentration of magnetic impurities [12]. It also describes

the localization of third sound waves in superfluid He films on a rough substrate with a superimposed uniform superfluid flow [13].

It is convenient to eliminate the nonlinear constraint, Eq. (2.1b), by parameterizing the matrix Q as,

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} [\mathbb{1}_N - qq^\dagger]^{1/2} - \mathbb{1}_N & q \\ q^\dagger & -[\mathbb{1}_N - q^\dagger q]^{1/2} + \mathbb{1}_N \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (2.3)$$

and to expand q and $q^\dagger$ in a quaternion basis,

$$q = \sum_r q_r \tau_r \quad , \quad q^\dagger = \sum_r q_r^\dagger \tau_r^\dagger \quad , \quad (2.4)$$

where $r = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $r = 0, 3$ for the symplectic and unitary models, respectively, and $\tau_0 = \mathbb{1}_2$, $\tau_{1,2,3} = -i\sigma_{x,y,z}$. The q_r are $N \times N$ matrices.

Let us consider the two-point q -vertex function, which is the inverse of the q - q propagator. The most general model is the symplectic one with the symmetry breaking term, Eq. (2.2), added. One obtains two different 2-point vertex functions for the channels $r = 0, 3$ and $r = 1, 2$, respectively. To Gaussian order they read,

$$\Gamma_{p-h}^{(2)}(p) = \frac{1}{T} (p^2 + H) + O(T^0) \quad , \quad (2.5a)$$

$$\Gamma_{p-p}^{(2)}(p) = \frac{1}{T} (p^2 + H + G) + O(T^0) \quad . \quad (2.5b)$$

The subscripts $p-h$ and $p-p$ refer to the particle-hole ($r = 0, 3$) and particle-particle ($r = 1, 2$) channels, respectively [4,11]. $G = 0$ corresponds to the symplectic model. In this case both vertex functions coincide and are soft, or massless, i.e. they vanish with vanishing wavenumber and frequency. The soft modes describe diffusion in the particle-hole and particle-particle channels. A nonzero G breaks time reversal invariance, and gives the particle-particle channel a mass. The particle-hole channel remains massless because of particle number conservation.

The most interesting physical quantity in the context of the localization problem is the conductivity, σ . It is related to $\Gamma_{p-h}^{(2)}$ by

$$\sigma = \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} T \Gamma_{p-h}^{(2)}(p) \quad , \quad (2.6)$$

where we have normalized σ by its SCBA value.

B. Renormalization

It is well known that the symplectic and unitary models defined by Eqs. (2.1) are renormalizable with two renormalization constants, one for the coupling constant T , and one field renormalization constant [3]. In the replica limit the field renormalization vanishes, and one has only one nontrivial renormalization constant, which we denote by Z_t . The symmetry

breaking term, Eq. (2.2), requires one additional renormalization constant, Z_g , for the coupling constant G . Denoting the renormalized disorder, frequency, mass, and conductivity by t , ω , g , and σ_r , respectively, the relations between the bare quantities and their renormalized counterparts are

$$T = \kappa^{-\epsilon} Z_t t \quad , \quad (2.7a)$$

$$\Omega = \kappa^2 Z_t \omega \quad , \quad (2.7b)$$

$$G = \kappa^2 Z_g Z_t g \quad , \quad (2.7c)$$

$$\sigma = Z_t \sigma_r \quad , \quad (2.7d)$$

with $\epsilon = d - 2$, and κ an arbitrary RG momentum scale. From the requirement that the bare theory must be independent of κ one obtains a RG equation [3] for σ_r ,

$$\left[\epsilon - \frac{1}{t} \beta(t, g) + \beta(t, g) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \gamma(t, g) \frac{\partial}{\partial g} + \left(\frac{1}{t} \beta(t, g) - d \right) \omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \right] \sigma_r(t, \omega, g) = 0 \quad . \quad (2.8)$$

Here $\beta(t, g) = dt/d \ln \kappa$ and $\gamma(t, g) = dg/d \ln \kappa$, with the derivatives taken at a fixed bare theory, are RG functions. They can be obtained in a loop expansion from the perturbation expansion for the vertex function, Eqs. (2.5), by standard methods. We have performed the calculation to two-loop order with the result,

$$\beta(t, g) = \epsilon t - \frac{t^2}{4} \frac{1}{1+g} - \frac{t^3}{32} \frac{g}{1+g} + O(t^4) \quad , \quad (2.9a)$$

$$\gamma(t, g) = -2g + \frac{t}{4} \frac{g^2}{1+g} + O(t^2) \quad . \quad (2.9b)$$

In the limits $g = 0$ (symplectic model), and $g = \infty$ (unitary model) Eq. (2.9a) reproduces well-known results [3]. The β -functions for these two cases are actually known to five-loop order [14,15]. However, for the sake of simplicity we will restrict ourselves to the two-loop result as contained in Eqs. (2.9). Consequently, all critical exponents, scaling functions, etc. will be valid to two-loop order only. Inspection of Eqs. (2.9) shows that they allow for two nontrivial fixed points (FP), viz. $(t^*, g^*) = (4\epsilon, 0)$, and $(t^*, g^*) = (\sqrt{32\epsilon}, \infty)$. The former is unstable with respect to g , while the latter is stable. These two FP correspond to the symplectic and unitary universality classes, respectively, of the Anderson transition.

III. THE EQUATION OF STATE

We now obtain the desired equation of state, i.e. the conductivity as a function of disorder t , frequency ω , and symmetry breaking parameter g , from the RG equation, Eq. (2.8). For simplicity we do this for the renormalized theory. Since all bare and renormalized quantities are proportional to each other, the same functional relations hold for both the bare and the renormalized theory, and we will drop the subscript on σ_r .

A. The Symplectic and Unitary Cases Revisited

Let us first reconsider the symplectic and unitary models. In either case there is no g -dependence, and the β -function is given by Eq. (2.9a) with $g = 0$ or $g = \infty$, respectively. At zero frequency the PDE (2.8) (without the $\partial/\partial g$ -term) then turns into an ODE, which is readily solved in terms of a quadrature. With our normalization condition for the conductivity, $\sigma(t \rightarrow 0, \omega = 0) \rightarrow 1$ (see Eq. (2.6)), we obtain for the static conductivity, $\sigma_0(t) \equiv \sigma(t, \omega = 0)$,

$$\sigma_0(t) = \exp \left(\int_0^t d\tau \left[\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{\epsilon}{\beta(\tau)} \right] \right) . \quad (3.1)$$

Of course, $\sigma_0(t) = 0$ is also a solution of the RG equation. The physical conductivity is determined by Eq. (3.1) only for $t < t_c$, where t_c is given by $\beta(t_c) = 0$. For $t > t_c$ the physical conductivity vanishes, and $\sigma_0(t)$ as given by Eq. (3.1), and interpreted as a principal value integral, has no direct physical meaning. For $t \lesssim t_c$ Eq. (3.1) yields,

$$\sigma_0(t) = c(t) |1 - t/t_c|^s , \quad (3.2a)$$

where the function $c(t)$ is analytic at $t = t_c$, and the conductivity exponent s is related to the correlation length exponent ν ,

$$s = \nu\epsilon = -\epsilon/\beta'(t_c) . \quad (3.2b)$$

The first equality in Eq. (3.2b) is known as Wegner's scaling law [16].

Using standard methods [17] it is now easy to express the general solution of the PDE, Eq. (2.8), for $g = 0$ or $g = \infty$ in terms of $\sigma_0(t)$. The associated system of ODEs is

$$\frac{d t}{\beta(t)} = \frac{d \ln \omega}{-d + \beta(t)/t} = \frac{d \ln \sigma}{-\epsilon + \beta(t)/t} . \quad (3.3)$$

Let us consider the equalities relating the first term and the third term, and the first term and the second term, respectively. The general solutions of these two ODEs are,

$$u_1 = \sigma/\sigma_0(t) , \quad (3.4a)$$

$$u_2 = \omega t^{-2/\epsilon} [\sigma_0(t)]^{-d/\epsilon} , \quad (3.4b)$$

where u_1 and u_2 are integration constants. The general solution of the PDE is $\tilde{F}(u_1, u_2) = 0$, with $\tilde{F}$ an arbitrary function of two variables. This can be rewritten as,

$$\sigma(t, \omega) = \sigma_0(t) F \left(\omega t^{2/\epsilon} \sigma_0^{-d/\epsilon}(t) \right) , \quad (3.5)$$

with F an arbitrary function of one variable. In order to determine F we need to impose a boundary condition. Since the conductivity at large frequencies ($\omega \approx 1$) is qualitatively insensitive to the disorder, we can normalize the conductivity by its value at $\omega = 1$,

$$\sigma(t, \omega = 1) = 1 . \quad (3.6)$$

From Eq. (3.5) this yields a transcendental equation for F , which can be rewritten as

$$x = [t_F(F(x))]^{2/\epsilon} [F(x)]^{d/\epsilon} , \quad (3.7)$$

where $t_F(x)$ is obtained as the inverse of the relation between F and σ_0 ,

$$F = 1/\sigma_0(t) \quad \rightarrow \quad t = t_F(F) . \quad (3.8)$$

Note that $t_F(F)$ has two branches. Finally, from Eq. (3.5) we know that $F(x) = \sigma/\sigma_0(t)$, with the argument of the function F given by $x = \omega t^{2/\epsilon} [\sigma_0(t)]^{-d/\epsilon}$. Using this in Eq. (3.7) we obtain the equation of state in the form,

$$\frac{\omega}{\sigma^{d/\epsilon}} = t^{-2/\epsilon} [t_F(\sigma/\sigma_0(t))]^{2/\epsilon} . \quad (3.9)$$

Equation (3.9) is identical with the result that was obtained by different methods in I. This shows that the resummation scheme of I is equivalent to solving the RG equation, Eq. (2.8), with the boundary condition given by Eq. (3.6). Let us write down explicit results by using the β -function, Eq. (2.9a), to two-loop order. The generalization to higher loop orders is straightforward, and has been given in I. To two-loop order we obtain for the symplectic model,

$$\frac{\omega}{\sigma^{d/\epsilon}} = (t/t_c)^{-2/\epsilon} \left[1 - \frac{1 - t/t_c}{\sigma} \right]^{2/\epsilon} , \quad (3.10a)$$

with $t_c = 4\epsilon$, and for the unitary one,

$$\frac{\omega}{\sigma^{d/\epsilon}} = (t/t_c)^{-2/\epsilon} \left[1 - \frac{1 - t^2/t_c^2}{\sigma^2} \right]^{1/\epsilon} . \quad (3.10b)$$

with $t_c = \sqrt{32\epsilon}$. Equation (3.10a) is the well-known result of Ref. [6]. The above derivation is essentially identical with the one given by Hikami [7]. Equation (3.10b) is the corresponding result for the unitary model, which was first derived in I. We note that the derivation using the RG equation is shorter and more transparent than the resummation scheme used in I.

B. The Crossover from Symplectic to Unitary Critical Behavior

We will now apply the same method to construct an equation of state for our more general model, defined by the symplectic model with the symmetry breaking term, Eq. (2.2). The RG equation is given by Eqs. (2.8), (2.9). Let us first consider the zero frequency conductivity, $\sigma_0(t, g) \equiv \sigma(t, \omega = 0, g)$. In this case the system of associated ODEs consists of two independent equations, which we choose as,

$$\frac{d t}{\beta(t, g)} = \frac{d g}{\gamma(t, g)} , \quad (3.11a)$$

$$\frac{d \ln \sigma_0}{\beta(t, g)/t - \epsilon} = \frac{d g}{\gamma(t, g)} \quad (3.11b)$$

The general solution of Eq. (3.11a) can be written in the form,

$$f_1(t, g) = u_1 \quad , \quad (3.12a)$$

with u_1 an integration constant. The general solution of Eq. (3.11b) reads,

$$\sigma_0 \exp \left(\int dg \frac{\epsilon - \beta(t, g)/t}{\gamma(t, g)} \right) = u_2 \quad , \quad (3.12b)$$

where u_2 is a second integration constant. The general solution of the PDE for σ_0 is given by $\tilde{F}(u_1, u_2) = 0$ with $\tilde{F}$ an arbitrary function, or

$$\sigma_0(t, g) = f(u_1) \tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g) \quad , \quad (3.12c)$$

with u_1 a function of t and g according to Eq. (3.12a), f an arbitrary function of u_1 , and

$$\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g) = \exp \left(\int dg \frac{\beta(t, g)/t - \epsilon}{\gamma(t, g)} \right) \quad , \quad (3.12d)$$

Note that for determining the indefinite integral in Eqs. (3.12b), (3.12d), t must be expressed in terms of g and u_1 by means of Eq. (3.12a). u_1 is kept fixed for the integration, and then replaced by $f_1(t, g)$ again.

Equation (3.12c) is the desired equation of state at zero frequency. What remains to be done is to determine u_1 or f_1 explicitly as a function of t and g , and to determine the unknown function f by imposing suitable boundary conditions. This is a substantially more complicated task than for the pure symplectic or unitary model. We first derive an explicit expression for the function f_1 , Eq. (3.12a). Even with the simple two-loop approximations for the RG functions, Eqs. (2.9), we have been unable to find a closed form representation for this function. However, it can be discussed analytically in certain limits. Let us first consider the case of weak symmetry breaking, $g \ll 1$. For $g = 0$ there is a fixed point already at one-loop order, and we can restrict ourselves to a one-loop approximation for the β -function, $\beta(t, g) \approx \epsilon t - (t^2/4)(1 - g)$. Since both g and t are small compared to unity, it is then sufficient to use the zero-loop approximation for the RG function γ , $\gamma(t, g) \approx -2g$. Equation (3.11a) is then readily integrated with the result,

$$f_1(t, g \rightarrow 0) = \frac{1}{g^{\epsilon/2}} \left[\frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{4\epsilon} + O(g) \right] \quad . \quad (3.13a)$$

In the same limit one obtains from Eq. (3.12d) $\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g) = tg^{\epsilon/2}$. With $t_c^0 \equiv t_c(g = 0) = 4\epsilon$ the critical disorder for the symplectic model, the zero frequency conductivity can be written,

$$\sigma_0(t, g \rightarrow 0) = tg^{\epsilon/2} f \left(\frac{1 - t/t_c^0}{tg^{\epsilon/2}} \right) \quad . \quad (3.13b)$$

For t near t_c^0 we thus obtain the scaling form which was first derived by Khmel'nitskii and Larkin from a scaling hypothesis [18]. We see that both the value of the conductivity at $t = t_c^0$ and the shift of the mobility edge are proportional to $g^{1/\phi}$ with $\phi = 2/\epsilon + O(1)$ the crossover exponent [18,19]. Comparing Eqs. (3.13b) and (3.10a) we also see that for large arguments (i.e., for $g \rightarrow 0$), the function f behaves like $f(x \rightarrow \infty) \sim x$.

Similarly, one obtains in the limit of large g ,

$$f_1(t, g \rightarrow \infty) = \frac{1}{g^\epsilon} \left[\frac{1}{t^2} - \frac{1}{32\epsilon} + \frac{1}{32g} \right] \equiv \frac{1}{g^\epsilon} \left[\frac{1}{t^2} - \frac{1}{t_c^2(g)} \right] . \quad (3.14a)$$

For $\tilde{\sigma}_0$ one obtains again $\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g) = tg^{\epsilon/2}$, so we have for the conductivity,

$$\sigma_0(t, g \rightarrow \infty) = tg^{\epsilon/2} f \left(\frac{1 - t^2/t_c^2(g)}{t^2 g^\epsilon} \right) . \quad (3.14b)$$

Close to criticality this leads to the scaling form

$$\sigma_0 = \sqrt{1 - t^2/t_c^2(g)} \Phi \left(\frac{1/g}{[1 - t^2/t_c^2(g)]^{\phi'}} \right) , \quad (3.14c)$$

with $\phi' = -1/\epsilon$. Here we have used that $f(x \rightarrow 0) \sim \sqrt{x}$, which can be seen by comparing Eqs. (3.14b) and (3.10b). Notice the qualitative difference between the scaling forms at small g , Eq. (3.13b), and at large g , Eq. (3.14c). In the former case, the conductivity is driven to zero because of a zero in the scaling function f , and the asymptotic critical behavior is determined by the behavior of f in the vicinity of that zero. This gives rise to a crossover from critical behavior governed by the symplectic fixed point to the asymptotic behavior which is governed by the unitary fixed point. We will see this crossover behavior in more detail below, when we determine the function f explicitly. In the latter case the conductivity vanishes due to the prefactor in Eq. (3.14c). The function Φ merely provides corrections to this asymptotic scaling behavior, and there is no crossover. The exponent ϕ' is a corrections to scaling exponent. The reason for this difference is that g is a relevant operator with respect to the symplectic fixed point, while $1/g$ is an irrelevant operator with respect to the unitary one. It is well known that a relevant operator leads to a crossover, while irrelevant ones lead to corrections to scaling. Our RG treatment thus does not confirm a previous conjecture that the scaling form of the conductivity is the same for both small and large g [19].

We now turn to the task of determining the scaling function f_1 for all g . A problem one encounters in that context is that the solution of the equation $f_1(t, g) = 0$, which determines the critical disorder of the system as a function of g , develops from a single root, $t = t_c^0$ for $g = 0$, into a double root, $t = \pm t_c^\infty$ for $g = \infty$. This problem can be solved as follows. It is convenient to switch from the variables (t, g) to new variables $(x, y) = (1/t, g/(1 + g))$. Equation (3.11a) reads in terms of these variables,

$$\frac{dx}{dy} = \frac{-\epsilon x + (1 - y)/4 + y/32x}{-2y(1 - y) + y^2(1 - y)/4x} . \quad (3.15)$$

Let us now consider flow equations for x and y that lead to the same f_1 , determined by Eq. (3.15), as the original ones, but are obtained by multiplying numerator and denominator on the r.h.s. of Eq. (3.15), by $-x$,

$$\frac{dx}{dl} = \epsilon x^2 - x(1 - y)/4 - y/32 , \quad (3.16a)$$

$$\frac{dy}{dl} = 2xy(1-y) - y^2(1-y)/4 \quad . \quad (3.16b)$$

These flow equations allow for four fixed points, viz. $(x_1, y_1) = (1/4\epsilon, 0)$, $(x_2, y_2) = (1/\sqrt{32\epsilon}, 1)$, $(x_3, y_3) = (-1/\sqrt{32\epsilon}, 1)$, and $(x_4, y_4) = (0, 0)$, and the flow diagram is shown in Fig. 1. Note that only the region $x > 0, y > 0$ in this diagram is physical, and that the region $x < 0$ serves a purely mathematical purpose. Important trajectories in this flow diagram are the curves $x = \chi_+(y)$, and $x = \chi_-(y)$, which connect the fixed points (1) and (2), and (3) and (4), respectively. We have determined only the qualitative behavior of these curves to the extent that we will need them, viz.

$$\chi_+(y \rightarrow 0) = x_1 - \text{const} \times y^{1/\phi} \quad , \quad (3.17a)$$

$$\chi_+(y \rightarrow 1) = x_2 + \frac{1}{8} \left(1 + O(\sqrt{\epsilon})\right) (1-y) \quad , \quad (3.17b)$$

and

$$\chi_-(y \rightarrow 0) = 0 \quad , \quad (3.17c)$$

$$\chi_-(y \rightarrow 1) = -x_2 + \frac{1}{8} \left(1 + O(\sqrt{\epsilon})\right) (1-y) \quad . \quad (3.17d)$$

The constant in Eq. 3.17a can only be determined numerically, and of $\chi_-(y \rightarrow 0)$ we will need to know only that it vanishes. We now write f_1 as a function of x and y in the following form,

$$f_1(x, y) = [x - \chi_+(y)] [x - \chi_-(y)] \frac{y^{-\epsilon/2}(1-y)^\epsilon}{y + x(1+y)^{\epsilon/2}} G(x, y) \quad . \quad (3.18)$$

The explicit part of this equation contains all qualitative features of the flow. In particular, all of the singular behavior has been built in, as well as the known behavior at small and large g , respectively. The function $G(x, y)$ is therefore a harmless function of both of its variables, and we approximate $G(x, y) \approx 1$. Changing the variables back to t and g , we then have

$$f_1(t, g) = [1/t - 1/t^*(g)] [1/t - 1/t_c(g)] \left[\frac{g}{1+g} + \frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{1}{1+g} \right)^{\epsilon/2} \right]^{-1} g^{-\epsilon/2} (1+g)^{-\epsilon/2} \quad , \quad (3.19a)$$

where

$$t_c(g \rightarrow 0) = 4\epsilon + \text{const} \times g^{\epsilon/2} \quad , \quad (3.19b)$$

$$t_c(g \rightarrow \infty) = \sqrt{32\epsilon} - \text{const}/g \quad , \quad (3.19c)$$

is the critical disorder as a function of g , and

$$t^*(g \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow \infty \quad , \quad (3.19d)$$

$$t^*(g \rightarrow \infty) = -\sqrt{32\epsilon} - \text{const}/g \quad . \quad (3.19e)$$

is the auxiliary curve corresponding to $\chi_-(y)$.

Now we are in a position to construct an approximate equation of state for the case of zero frequency that contains all qualitative features which we have discussed so far. Let us return to Eq. (3.12c). As we have seen, $\tilde{\sigma}_0$ is equal to $tg^{\epsilon/2}$ both for small g and for large g , and we approximately put $\tilde{\sigma}_0 = tg^{\epsilon/2}$ everywhere. From Eqs. (3.13b) and (3.14b) we see that the function $f(u_1)$ is proportional to u_1 for large u_1 and proportional to $\sqrt{u_1}$ for small u_1 . This function can therefore be adequately modeled by $f(x) = \sqrt{x(1+x)}$. We now have,

$$\sigma_0(t, g) = tg^{\epsilon/2} [f_1(t, g)(1 + f_1(t, g))]^{1/2} \quad , \quad (3.20)$$

with $f_1(t, g)$ from Eqs. (3.19).

Equations (3.19), (3.20) are the desired result for the equation of state, i.e. for the conductivity as a function of the disorder t and the symmetry breaking parameter g at zero frequency. Let us briefly discuss this result. For $g \rightarrow 0$, $1/t^*$ vanishes, t_c approaches 4ϵ , f_1 diverges like $g^{-\epsilon/2}$, and σ_0 becomes independent of g . Equation (3.20) then reproduces the result for the symplectic model, Eq. (3.10a) at $\omega = 0$. For $g \rightarrow \infty$, $1/t^*$ approaches $-1/t_c(g = \infty) = -1/\sqrt{32\epsilon}$, and f_1 vanishes like $g^{-\epsilon}$. Again σ_0 becomes independent of g , and Eq. (3.20) reproduces the result for the unitary model, Eq. (3.10b) at $\omega = 0$. If one approaches the critical disorder, $t \rightarrow t_c(g)$, at fixed but small g ($g \ll 1$), then the critical region consists of two regimes. For $|t - t_c(g)| \gg g^{\epsilon/2}$ one has $f_1 \gg 1$, and σ_0 shows a behavior characteristic of approaching the symplectic localization transition. In particular, the critical exponent $s = 1$. However, when $|t - t_c(g)| \ll g^{\epsilon/2}$ one has $f_1 \ll 1$, and the asymptotic approach to the phase transition is governed by the critical behavior of the unitary model. This is the crossover behavior induced by the instability of the symplectic fixed point with respect to the relevant operator g . With increasing g the crossover region moves away from the critical point, and for sufficiently large values of g it is outside of the critical region. The critical behavior is then entirely that of the unitary model, with corrections to scaling due to the irrelevant variable $1/g$.

We finally take the frequency into account. We choose the third ODE associated with the PDE, Eq. (2.8), as,

$$\frac{d \ln \omega}{-d + \beta(t, g)/t} = \frac{dg}{\gamma(t, g)} \quad . \quad (3.21a)$$

The general solution reads,

$$\omega t^{2/\epsilon} [\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g)]^{-d/\epsilon} = u_3 \quad , \quad (3.21b)$$

with u_3 a third integration constant, in addition to u_1 and u_2 . The general solution of the full PDE can then be written as,

$$\sigma(t, \omega, g) = \tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g) G\left(f_1(t, g), \omega t^{2/\epsilon} [\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g)]^{-d/\epsilon}\right) \quad , \quad (3.22)$$

with G an arbitrary function of two variables. The function f of Eq. (3.12c) is related to G by $G(x, 0) = f(x)$. We now impose the same boundary condition as in Sec. III A, namely $\sigma(t, \omega = 1, g) = 1$. The transcendental equation for $G(u_1, x)$ analogous to Eq. (3.7) then reads,

$$x = [t_G (G(u_1, x), u_1)]^{2/\epsilon} [G(u_1, x)]^{d/\epsilon} \quad , \quad (3.23)$$

Here t_G , which is a function of two variables, is obtained as follows. In the relation $G = 1/\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g)$ we express $g = g(t, u_1)$ as a function of t and u_1 according to Eq. (3.12a). t_G is then given explicitly as a function of G and u_1 ,

$$G = 1/\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g(t, u_1)) \quad \rightarrow \quad t = t_G(G, u_1) \quad . \quad (3.24)$$

Now we restore the frequency dependence. With $x = \omega t^{2/\epsilon} [\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g)]^{-d/\epsilon}$ one has $G(u_1, x) = \sigma/\tilde{\sigma}_0$. Inserted into Eq. (3.23) this yields,

$$\frac{\omega}{\sigma^{d/\epsilon}} = t^{-2/\epsilon} t_G(\sigma/\tilde{\sigma}_0(t, g), f_1(t, g)) \quad . \quad (3.25)$$

This is the desired equation of state for the general model. It contains the previous results for the symplectic ($g = 0$) and unitary ($g = \infty$) models as special cases, and explicitly describes the crossover as demonstrated above. It also gives a physically correct description of both the metallic and the insulating phases. This has been discussed in detail in I, and can be seen from Eqs. (3.10), in the limits $g = 0$ and $g = \infty$. Since the frequency dependence of the conductivity is qualitatively the same in both limits, this is also true for arbitrary values of g , and hence for Eq. (3.25).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Ted Kirkpatrick for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the NSF under grant number DMR-92-09879.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B **59**, 79 (1975); E. Brézin and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 3110 (1976); D. R. Nelson and R. A. Pelcovits, Phys. Rev. B **16**, 2191 (1977).
- [2] F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **35**, 207 (1979).
- [3] See, e.g., J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, Clarendon Press (Oxford 1989).
- [4] For a review, see, P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 287 (1985).
- [5] The 'equation of state' in question is *not* a thermodynamic equation of state, but a relation between the electrical conductivity, the disorder, and the frequency, which is analogous to the equation of state for a Heisenberg ferromagnet described by a nonlinear σ -model. For simplicity, we will just call this relation the equation of state throughout the paper.
- [6] B. Shapiro and E. Abrahams, Phys. Rev. B **24**, 4889 (1981); D. Belitz, A. Gold, and W. Götze, Z. Phys. B **44**, 273 (1981); D. Vollhardt and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 699 (1982). The technique used in these papers was based on W. Götze, Solid State Commun. **27**, 1393 (1978).
- [7] S. Hikami, in *Anderson Localization*, edited by Y. Nagaoka and H. Fukuyama (Springer, Berlin 1982), p.15.
- [8] A. M. M. Pruisken and Z. Wang, Nucl. Phys. B **322**, 721 (1989).
- [9] D. Belitz and S. Q. Yang, Nucl. Phys. B **401**, 548 (1993).
- [10] S. Q. Yang, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Oregon (1994) (unpublished).
- [11] See, e.g., D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 261 (1994).
- [12] K. B. Efetov, A. I. Larkin, and D. E. Khmel'nitskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **79**, 1120 (1980) [Sov. Phys. JETP **52**, 568 (1980)].
- [13] S. M. Cohen, J. Machta, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and C. A. Condat, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 785 (1987).
- [14] F. Wegner, Nucl. Phys. B **316**, 663 (1989).
- [15] S. Hikami, Progr. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **107**, 213 (1992).
- [16] F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **25**, 327 (1976).
- [17] See, e.g., E. C. Zachmanoglou and D. W. Thoe, *Introduction to Partial Differential Equations with Applications*, Dover (New York 1986).
- [18] D. E. Khmel'nitskii and A. I. Larkin, Solid State Commun. **39**, 1069 (1981).
- [19] R. Oppermann, J. Phys. (Paris) **45**, L1161 (1984).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Schematic flow diagram for the flow equations, Eqs. (3.16)

